

**PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " REGARDING THE
SPECIFIC NAME TO BE ADOPTED FOR THE TYPE SPECIES OF A
GENUS IN CASES WHERE THAT SPECIES POSSESSES TWO OR
MORE OBJECTIVELY SYNONYMOUS SUCH NAMES**

By **FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.) 908)

The present application arises out of current work on the preparation of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* for publication in book form and is in a sense an extension of a proposal numbered Z.N.(S.) 878, in which it was recommended that the Commission should adopt a *Declaration* that " where two or more nominal species are objectively identical with one another (the two species being based upon the same type specimen, the two names being in consequence objective synonyms of one another) and where one of these nominal species is one of two or more such species included in a nominal genus established prior to 1st January 1931, a later author is to be accepted as having made a valid type selection under Rule (g) in Article 30 if he so selects any of the objectively identical nominal species in question, irrespective of whether the nominal species so selected is that which was cited by the author of the generic name at the time when he established the nominal genus so cited " (1955, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 11(3) : 86—89).

2. The purpose of the proposal quoted above was to rid the *Règles* of an anomaly, under which it has hitherto been necessary to reject as invalid the selection of a nominal species to be the type species of a genus in a case where, although the nominal species in question was not one of the nominal species included in that genus, an objectively identical nominal species was one of the originally included species. The problem was illustrated in the foregoing application by the case of the genus *Homarus* Weber, 1795. One of the nominal species included in that genus by Weber was *Astacus marinus* Fabricius, 1775. That nominal species had not however been established by Fabricius as a new species, the name *marinus* having been published merely as a substitute for the name *gammarus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Cancer gammarus*. The nominal species *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus and *Astacus marinus* Fabricius are thus objectively identical with one another, each being based upon the same type specimen, and the specific names *gammarus* Linnaeus and *marinus* Fabricius are objective synonyms of one another. Miss Rathbun (1904) selected *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus to be the type species of *Homarus* Weber, but, as the nominal species in question had been cited by Weber under its objective synonym *marinus* Fabricius and not under the name *gammarus* Linnaeus, her type selection for the genus *Homarus* Weber was

technically defective and has had to be rejected. The object of the proposal submitted in Application Z.N.(S.) 878 was to remove this ritualistic provision and to secure that in a case such as that described above the selection of either of the objectively identical nominal species to be the type species of the genus concerned is to be accepted as a valid selection under Rule (g) in Article 30, irrespective of which of the nominal species concerned was cited by the original author at the time when he established the nominal genus in question.

3. The purpose of the present application is to ask the Commission to carry the above proposal to its logical conclusion by providing, if we may continue to use the example cited above, that the nominal species to be accepted as the type species of *Homarus* Weber, 1795, shall be *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus, 1758 (the nominal species having the oldest available of the objectively synonymous names concerned) and not *Astacus marinus* Fabricius, 1775 (the nominal species having the later of the two objectively synonymous names). The problem here discussed has arisen in connection with a number of generic names already placed on the *Official List*. It seems anomalous to be under the necessity of citing as the type species of a genus a nominal species, the name of which is not only invalid but also probably unknown to the great majority of workers in the group, when there exists an objectively synonymous name for the species in question which is the valid name for that species and is universally used for it.

4. I accordingly recommend the International Commission to render a *Declaration* on the following lines :—

DRAFT DECLARATION :—Where there are two or more identical nominal species (i.e. nominal species the names of which are objective synonyms of one another), the designation, indication or selection of any one of these nominal species to be the type species of a genus is to be treated as the designation, indication or selection of whichever of the nominal species concerned has the oldest available name, irrespective of whether or not that nominal species was cited by the author of the name of the genus in question. *Example* : The nominal species *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Astacus marinus* Fabricius, 1775, are objectively identical with one another. The second, but not the first, of these nominal species was placed by Weber in his genus *Homarus* in 1795. *Astacus marinus* Fabricius was the first of the originally included nominal species to be selected to be the type species of *Homarus* Weber. Since the name *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus is (a) an available name and (b) a senior objective synonym of the name *Astacus marinus* Fabricius, the nominal species *Cancer gammarus* Linnaeus is to be treated as the type species of the genus *Homarus* Weber.